

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 5, 6, 28, and 45-52 are pending. Claims 5, 6 and 28 were rejected. Claims 5, and 28 are amended. Claims 45-52 are newly added. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 40-44 are canceled. The amendments to claims 5 and 28 are supported by originally-filed claims 5 and 28. The amendments to claims 5 and 28 are provided to improve the syntax and readability and not for the purpose of distinguishing the claimed invention over the cited art. New claims 45-52 are supported by originally-filed claims 7, 8, 10, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, respectively.

Priority

The Examiner acknowledged the Applicants' claim of foreign priority but indicated in the Office Action Summary that a certified copy of the foreign priority document was not received. A certified copy of the priority document was filed on May 9, 2001. As evidence of the filing of the priority document and the claim of priority, enclosed is a copy of the claim of priority (including Express Mail certificate under 35 U.S.C. 1.10) and the first page of the certified copy of the priority document, both of which were printed from PAIR and include the USPTO's date stamp. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to acknowledge receipt of the priority document.

Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to by the Examiner as allegedly not being "checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors." The Examiner requested that Applicants correct any errors of which they become aware. The specification was amended in the Preliminary Amendment filed on May 9, 2001. Applicants will further amend the specification as they become aware of any errors. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Objection to the Abstract

The abstract was objected to for allegedly not being in the proper language and format. The abstract as amended is in proper form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102

Claims 5, 6 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,749,081 to Whiteis (hereinafter "Whiteis"). Claim 5 includes a feature neither disclosed nor suggested by Whiteis, namely:

the number of times or the content of the recommendation which a user attempting to receive recommendation receives is determined depending on the number of times said user carried out registration by using said content registration means. (emphasis added)

Whiteis describes a system that provides a customer with a recommendation based on how many times an item known to a user is linked with other items (col. 3, lines 13-15). In particular, a user chooses items from a master list of items (col. 3, lines 14-15; col. 4, lines 42-44). The system searches for additional items that are paired or linked with the items chosen by the user (col. 3, lines 15-21; col. 4, lines 47-49). The items most frequently linked with the chosen items are recommended to the user (col. 3, lines 21-23; col. 4, lines 49-67; col. 5, lines. 28-48). In other words, the Whiteis system processes the user's input list to generate a recommended selection of items based on links between the items in the user's input list and the selected items where the links are based on selections by prior users.

In contrast, the apparatus provides a recommendation to a user depending on the number of times that same user carried out registration. An exemplary embodiment of this feature is described in the last paragraph of page 68 of the specification extending through page 69. In that exemplary embodiment, the determination of whether to provide a user with a recommendation depends on the number of times that the user carried out registration. In the described example, a user carried out registration two times and there existed a rule that a recommendation is provided five times for each registration. Therefore, if the number of recommendation times is nine or less, an additional recommendation may be provided.

However, Whiteis neither discloses nor suggests a system that uses the number of times a user carries out registration to determine whether that same user receives a recommendation or to determine the content of a recommendation. Thus, claim 5 is not anticipated by Whiteis at least because Whiteis neither discloses nor suggests using the number of times a user carries out registration to determine whether to provide a recommendation.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant respectfully requests therefore that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) be withdrawn. Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and, thus, is likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5. Claim 28 includes the same feature of claim 5 described above and is therefore not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests therefore that the rejection of claims 6 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

Newly added claims 45-47 depend from claim 5 and include the features of claim 5. Newly added method claim 48 includes a feature similar to that described above with regard to claim 5 and claims 50-52 depend from and include the features of claim 48. Accordingly, new claims 45-52 are allowable for the reasons described above with regard to claim 5.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel N. Calder, Reg. No. 27,424
Christopher J. Dervishian, Reg. No. 42,480
Attorneys for Applicants

CJD/dlm

Attachments: Abstract
Claim of priority
First page of the certified copy of priority document

Dated: January 20, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

January 20, 2005

